



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: SPII: Odd situation - alert

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Mon, May 4, 2015 at 8:43 AM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>

Cc: Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@lacity.org>

Attached please find the updated database for South Park II.

There are only two changes:

1) A new APN has been added, and five have been deleted. The new APN is **5139009016**. This APN replaces five other APNs, which have been removed from the database (the prior 5 are listed in my original email below.) Simple explanation: Five parcels were purchased by a new owner who collapsed them into one new APN, and the new APN has a slightly smaller lot than the sum of the original five. The net result is an approx \$500 reduction to the budget. This does not even affect the % ownership for other parcels, as the change = only 0.002% of the total budget.

2) Garen - per your request, I have also added something you requested: to note the public parcels that have been discounted 9% to remove the marketing portion of the SPII assessment.) This affects only one parcel - APN **5134025900** (City Fire Station #10) and is shown in the Notes for that APN (Column BG.)

Please send the updated database so we're on the same page should something come up.

Thanks, Tara.

On Thu, Apr 23, 2015 at 2:26 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

We have an oddity we've encountered now that we're out to petition:

We have five parcels in SPII that have been recently collapsed into one. A new owner bought 4 parcels from one owner and 1 from another and has now combined them. 5 old APNs have been replaced with 1 new.

The ownership HAS been very recently recorded. The updated data for the new parcel is just a tiny bit different than the sum of the prior/old 5 parcels, so the assessment for the new single parcel is approx. \$500 less than the five former parcels used to total.

This has a statistically negligible impact on the overall budget and everyone's % (most if not all parcels remain the same percentage.) We have updated the dbase, and will later update the MDP/ER (we are awaiting some minor non-substantive edits from Miranda and will do those all at once before the BID goes to Council.) I also wanted to alert you to this in case we get the new owner's petition - you'll know the background on the change.

Let me know if you have any questions or feedback.

The five former APNs are:

5139009001 (former owner LR 1001 S OLIVE)

5139009002

5139009004

5139009014

5139010009 (former owner: BRYKRIST)

New parcel:

5139009016 (new owner is LMC 1001 S OLIVE HOLDINGS LLC)

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE

DEVINE STRATEGIES

645 West Ninth St.,#110-293

Los Angeles, CA 90015


310.430.5121

tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

 **2015.05.04 SP II database - includes updates made during petition stage.xlsx**
93K



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: Three petitions

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:05 PM

To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>

Cc: "Yegparian, Garen" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Of course. I have mostly cleared my plate through Thursday to put SPII first, and will endeavor to reply to everything very quickly. Answers below.

#1 - Let me review calculations and get back to you shortly.

#2 - Thank you; we weren't aware that these parcels were combined, but it makes sense as they are planned for development; Should we go ahead and make the change in the database? Should we also update the parcel rolls in MDP/ER?

#3 - Yes, neither Meruelo Maddux nor its successor, EVOQ, has owned any of these properties for some time. These parcels have had a complex change, which I can support with the news articles cited below:

a) As you may have read in the news a few years ago, MM went into bankruptcy - Meruelo and Maddox were ousted and the firm emerged as EVOQ under entirely new leadership: http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-evoq-hopes-to-thrive/article_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html

b) In late 2103: EVOQ sold these properties to Mack Urban: <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/oct/02/business/la-fi-property-report-20131003>

DTLA South Park Properties is the correct owner of record for these parcels per owner Mack Urban. They do not know why the change has not been recorded since the sale occurred about 18 months ago. It appears that some of their parcel changes were recorded and others not!

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 1:21 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, Garen has been off this week so I'm going through the petitions.

I have a question about City owned parcel 5139019900 (the Public Works Bldg). How did you come up with 1,341' frontage? The parcel only has a total of 637' total street frontage. I noticed in the frontage columns there is FComm = 645' and FGovt = 696', It's obvious that those two were added to get 1,341', but what are they, and I don't see how you can come up with a total that's more than the entire parcel's street frontage.

The next issue is that there are more parcels that have been combined. 5139024003, 014 & 015 are now 017. The good news is that the ownership, bldg sqft, frontage, and land area is the same as before.

The last issue is that one of the petitions has DTLA South Park Properties on it, but the County has Meruelo Maddux 336 W 11th St LLC. Has there been a recent ownership change that you know of?

I don't have to say that we are in an extreme time crunch, please get back to me as you as you can.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 10:41 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the three additional petitions I alluded to in yesterday's email. The ownership listed is current and correct, but I am not sure if your data will match and we may need to furnish additional documentation. Please let me know about any problem petitions as soon as you are able. (The attached ones are the ones I'm most concerned about.)

Thanks!

--
Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
213-978-1120



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: Three petitions

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>
Cc: "Yegparian, Garen" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 3:31 PM

Starting with the easier...

#3 - for which APN or APNs does the ownership still reflect Meruelo Maddux? I'm not clear from your original email. I will contact the owner and see if they can provide a deed or closing papers. In the meantime, I also want to take the parcel(s) out of our % tally. Thanks!

#1 - We had to do some digging, and you are correct - this is an error. We think we know how it occurred. It appears to have happened during one of our January versions of the database. When reviewing our data, Garen got a different frontage calculation (638) than we did; we redid our calculation and reduced the frontage from 696 to 645. **645 was mistakenly input into the FComm column, rather than updating the 696 in FGovt.** As a result, the formulas swept both numbers up and added them together. We are glad to catch this now, and deeply regret the error.

I assume we should:

- update all figures/tables/public parcels section/parcel rolls in MDP and ER
- update database
- regenerate petition and ship to Miranda/Eugene (I believe Miranda signed off yesterday and asked Eugene to have Holly sign)

This will not affect assessments for other parcels, but it will affect their percentage (this will be statistically significant) so we'll push to exceed the petition threshold by an amount at least equal to to the City's drop.

Please confirm if the above is the correct/complete course of action.

We will probably need until tomorrow to make all these changes, but I believe we can get everything in.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:30 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, thanks for the quick reply.

#1 I'll wait for your results on that.

#2 Yes, please update the data and the MDP/ER

#3 Unfortunately, we can't accept news articles as proof of ownership. A deed, closing papers, some property reports are things we can review and accept if deemed valid. Fortunately, this particular parcel isn't that much % loss if you can't get those things during the petition drive.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:05 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Of course. I have mostly cleared my plate through Thursday to put SPII first, and will endeavor to reply to everything very quickly. Answers below.

#1 - Let me review calculations and get back to you shortly.

#2 - Thank you; we weren't aware that these parcels were combined, but it makes sense as they are planned for development; Should we go ahead and make the change in the database? Should we also update the parcel rolls in MDP/ER?

#3 - Yes, neither Meruelo Maddux nor its successor, EVOQ, has owned any of these properties for some time. These parcels have had a complex change, which I can support with the news articles cited below:

a) As you may have read in the news a few years ago, MM went into bankruptcy - Meruelo and Maddox were ousted and the firm emerged as EVOQ under entirely new leadership: http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-evoq-hopes-to-thrive/article_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html

b) In late 2103: EVOQ sold these properties to Mack Urban: <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/oct/02/business/la-fi-property-report-20131003>

DTLA South Park Properties is the correct owner of record for these parcels per owner Mack Urban. They do not know why the change has not been recorded since the sale occurred about 18 months ago. It appears that some of their parcel changes were recorded and others not!

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 1:21 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, Garen has been off this week so I'm going through the petitions.

I have a question about City owned parcel 5139019900 (the Public Works Bldg). How did you come up with 1,341' frontage? The parcel only has a total of 637' total street frontage. I noticed in the frontage columns there is FComm = 645' and FGovt = 696', It's obvious that those two were added to get 1,341', but what are they, and I don't see how you can come up with a total that's more than the entire parcel's street frontage.

The next issue is that there are more parcels that have been combined. 5139024003, 014 & 015 are now 017. The good news is that the ownership, bldg sqft, frontage, and land area is the same as before.

The last issue is that one of the petitions has DTLA South Park Properties on it, but the County has Meruelo Maddux 336 W 11th St LLC. Has there been a recent ownership change that you know of?

I don't have to say that we are in an extreme time crunch, please get back to me as you as you can.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 10:41 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the three additional petitions I alluded to in yesterday's email. The ownership listed is current and correct, but I am not sure if your data will match and we may need to furnish additional documentation. Please let me know about any problem petitions as soon as you are able. (The attached ones are the ones I'm most concerned about.)

Thanks!

--

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
213-978-1120

--

Dennis Rader
Technical Research Supervisor
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division
213-978-1120